

REMARKS

By this paper, claims 51-55 are amended, claims 64-78 are added, and claims 56-63 are cancelled without prejudice and without disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 51-55 and 64-78 are all of the pending claims. Support for the amendments presented above is provided throughout the specification and claims as originally filed. Applicants expressly reserve the right to prosecute the subject matter of the unamended and/or cancelled claims, or any other subject matter supported by the Specification, in one or more continuation applications. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all the pending claims is anticipated.

Examiner Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended to Applicants' Representative in the telephonic Examiner Interview conducted September 17, 2009. In the Interview, proposed amendments to the claims were presented to the Examiner, which the Examiner indicated were distinguishable over the cited references and would require additional searching and consideration. This agreement is evidenced in the Interview Summary mailed September 21, 2009. Accordingly, Applicants have incorporated the previously proposed amendments into the claims by this Response.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 51-63 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for allegedly failing to satisfy the written description requirement, and for allegedly failing to satisfy the enablement requirement. Without acknowledging the propriety of these rejections, Applicants have amended the claims to remove the allegedly unsupported claimed subject matter. As such, the rejections of claims 51-63 under § 112 are believed to be moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 51-63 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,369,840 to Barnett *et al.* ("Barnett") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,101,510 to Stone *et al.* ("Stone"). Applicants traverse this rejection

at least on the grounds that the sections of Barnett and Stone relied on in the Office Action do not teach all of the features of the amended claims.

For example, independent claim 51 recites *inter alia* the following features, which are not taught or suggested in the sections of Barnett and/or Stone relied on in the Office Action:

...storing in electronic storage associated with a first server device, a collection of networked information monitor templates, the collection of networked information monitor templates comprising a first networked information monitor template configured to define a first networked information monitor,

wherein the first networked information monitor template comprises:

...instructions configured (i) to cause the first networked information monitor to request content from the one or more uniform resource locators in the content reference, and (ii) to cause the first networked information monitor to render a graphical user interface having a frame within which content received from the one or more uniform resource locators is displayed, wherein the one or more controls defined by the control characteristics are the only controls provided on the frame of the graphical user interface for manual navigation of a network via the first networked information monitor....

The sections of Barnett cited in the Office Action describe a web-based calendaring system that is displayed to users in a web browser. The portions of Stone that are relied on discuss the embedding of a web browser in other types of documents. These sections of the cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a server storing a networked information monitor template as recited in claim 51 including the features reproduced above. For at least this reason, the rejection of claim 51 based on the proposed combination of Barnett and Stone should be withdrawn.

Claims 52-55 depend from claim 51. As such, the rejection of claims 52-55 based on the proposed combination of Barnett and Stone should be withdrawn due to the dependency of these claims, as well as for the features that they recite individually.

Newly Added Claims

Claims 64-78 are newly added by this Response.

Claims 64-68 depend from claim 51. As such, claims 64-68 are believed to be

allowable over the cited references at least by virtue of their dependency, as well as for the features that they recite individually.

Independent claim 69 is believed to be allowable over the cited references at least because claim 69 recites features that are not disclosed or taught in the cited references. For example, claim 69 recites *inter alia* the following features, which are not disclosed, taught, or suggested in the cited references:

...one or more servers, the one or more servers comprising:
electronic storage configured to store a collection of networked information monitor templates, the collection of networked information monitor templates comprising a first networked information monitor template configured to define a first networked information monitor,
wherein the first networked information monitor template comprises:
...instructions configured (i) to cause the first networked information monitor to request content from the one or more uniform resource locators in the content reference, and (ii) to cause the first networked information monitor to render a graphical user interface having a frame within which content received from the one or more uniform resource locators is displayed, wherein the one or more controls defined by the control characteristics are the only controls provided on the frame of the graphical user interface for manual navigation of a network via the first networked information monitor....

These features are not taught by the cited portions of Barnett and/or Stone, alone or in combination [see *above*]. For at least this reason, claim 69 is believed to be allowable over the cited references.

Claims 70-78 depend from claim 69. As such, claims 70-78 are believed be allowable over the cited references by virtue of their dependency, as well as for the features that they recite individually.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is anticipated.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Date: November 9, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By:



D. Benjamin Esplin
Reg. No. 58,297

Customer No. 00909

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, Virginia 22102
619-234-5000